

**REMARKS**

Entry of the amended claims is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 since the amendments: (1) place the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); (2) do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration (since the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution without incorporating additional subject matter); (3) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; and/or (4) place the application in better form for appeal (if necessary). Entry is thus requested.

By the present response, Applicant has amended claims 1, 8-12, 16 and 19-22 to further clarify the invention. Claims 1-16 and 18-25 are pending in this application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

In the Office Action, claim 16 has been objected to because of informalities. Claims 1-8, 10 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 11 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0043508 (Schulz et al.). Claims 1-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schulz et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0205785 (Takahashi et al.). Claims 9, 13-16 and 18-25 have been allowed. Claims 10 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Serial No. **10/786,309**  
Amendment dated January 16, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of November 6, 2006

Docket No. **IK-0062**

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for allowing claims 9, 13-16 and 18-25 and for indicating that claim 10 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the § 112 rejections and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

**Claim Objections**

Claim 16 has been objected to because of informalities. Applicant has amended this claim to further clarify the invention and respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn.

**35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections**

Claims 1-8, 10 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicant has amended these claims to further clarify the invention and respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

**35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections**

Claims 11 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Schulz et al. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Schulz et al. discloses a disc drive that comprises an improved electrical interconnect for connecting the head to read/write circuitry on a printed circuit board. A single-cable interconnect has both head suspension capability and dynamic loop function. A pre-amplifier can be connected at either the printed circuit board or mounted on the interconnect.

Amendment dated January 16, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of November 6, 2006

Regarding claim 11, Applicant submits that Schulz et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of this claim of, *inter alia*, a folded portion formed by folding a portion of the flexible cable between the first and second ends, two strips of cable extending from the folded portion in the same direction initially, or wherein a vertex of the curved portion does not deviate from vertical alignment with the second end prior to movement of the first end. The interconnect 214 in Schulz et al. has multiple portions including an FOS portion 322 extending to one side, a PCCA portion 323 extending approximately perpendicular to the FOS portion 322, and a BCM portion 324 extending in an opposite and parallel direction to the FOS portion 322. This is not a flexible cable having a folded portion, two strips of cable extending from the folded portion in the same direction initially, as recited in the claims of the present application. Clearly, Schulz et al. discloses and illustrates the interconnect 214 having portions extending in multiple directions, not the same. This is not two strips extending from the folded portion in the same direction initially.

Further, Schultz et al. does not disclose or suggest where a vertex of the curved portion does not deviate from a vertical alignment with the second end prior to movement of the first end. The Examiner asserts that portion 234 is Applicant's claimed curved portion. However, a vortex of dynamic loop 234 in Schulz et al. is not in vertical alignment with any end of interconnect 214. Thus, Schulz et al. does not disclose or suggest where a vertex of the curved

Amendment dated January 16, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of November 6, 2006

portion does not deviate from vertical alignment with the second end prior to movement of the first end, as recited in the claims of the present application.

Regarding claim 12, Applicant submits that this claim is dependent on independent claim 11, and, therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Schultz et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of claims 11 and 12 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schultz et al. in view of Takahashi et al. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Takahashi et al. discloses a tray-side terminal area of a disc drive unit and a body-side terminal area on the body chassis side being connected electrically to each other by the use of a flat belt-shaped connecting wire. The belt-shaped connecting wire is one general-purpose, belt-shaped FFC with a given width and a given length that is folded at 45.degrees at two positions in its center. A part of the FFC on the side of the body-side terminal area is fixed on a body chassis, while a part of the FFC on the side of tray-side terminal area is lifted and bent in the shape of a horizontal U in the middle.

Regarding claim 1, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of these claims of, *inter alia*, a folded portion formed by folding a portion of the cable main body so that two opposing faces are in contact with each, two strips of the cable extending from the folded portion being in the same direction initially, or whereby corresponding movement of the flexible cable main body is configured to occur only to one side of the folded portion connected to the at least one moveable part. As noted previously, Schulz et al. does not disclose or suggest these limitations in the claims of the present application.

The Examiner admits that Schulz et al. does not disclose or suggest two opposing faces in contact with each other, but asserts that Takahashi et al. discloses these limitations in Figures 6A-7. However, Takahashi et al. merely discloses a flat, belt-shaped connecting wire that may be folded in different positions. This is not a folded portion formed by folding a portion of the cable main body where two strips of the cable extending from the folded portion are in the same direction initially, as recited in the claims of the present application. In Takahashi et al. as clearly shown in the figures, when the flat wire is folded, portions extending from the flat wire are not initially in the same direction. The wire must be folded at least one or more times before the ends of the wire are positioned in the same direction. This is not two strips of the cable extending from the folded portion in the same direction initially, as recited in the claims of the

present application. As shown in Figures 6C and 6D, and disclosed in paragraphs 51 and 52, two creases are disclosed in Schultz et al.

Further, none of the cited references disclose or suggest where movement of the flexible cable main body is configured to occur only to one side of the folded portion connected to the at least one moveable part.

Regarding claims 2-8, Applicant submits that these claims are dependent on independent claim 1 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1-8 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Serial No. 10/786,309

Docket No. IK-0062

Amendment dated January 16, 2007

Reply to Office Action of November 6, 2006

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that claims 1-16 and 18-25 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Frederick D. Bailey, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim  
Registration No. 36,186  
Frederick D. Bailey  
Registration No. 42,282

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
703 766-3701 DYK/FDB:tlgilg

Date: January 16, 2007  
\\Fk4\\Documents\\2047\\2047-059\\110710.doc

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610